

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) Regarding the Future Disposition of the Mohave Generating Station.

Application 02-05-046
(Filed May 17, 2002)

**OPINION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO WATER AND ENERGY CONSULTING
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 04-12-016**

Summary

This decision awards Water and Energy Consulting (WEC) \$262,578.00 in compensation for its contribution to Decision (D.) 04-12-016. This represents a decrease of \$51,669.09 from the amount requested.

Background

The Mohave Generating Station (Mohave) is a two-unit, coal-fired power plant located in Laughlin, Nevada. Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is the plant operator and owns a 56% undivided interest in Mohave which entitles SCE to approximately 885 Megawatts (MW). Pursuant to the terms of a 1999 Consent Decree¹ specific environmental controls must be installed at

¹ Mohave Environmental Consent Decree settled a federal civil lawsuit, CV-S-98-00305-LDG (RJ), that was filed in 1997 by Grand Canyon Trust, Inc., Sierra Club, Inc., and National Parks and Conservation Association, Inc. against SCE and the other Mohave co-owners alleging various air quality violations at Mohave. SCE and the other co-owners were signatories to the 1999 Consent Decree.

Mohave for it to continue in operation post 2005. On May 17, 2002, SCE filed an application seeking Commission authorization to either make the necessary environmental expenditures, or close the plant.

Mohave obtains all of its coal supply from the Black Mesa coal mine which is located approximately 273 miles east of Mohave in northeast Arizona. The mine is on lands of the Hopi Tribe and Navajo Nation. The coal is transported from the mine to Mohave by a coal-slurry pipeline that requires that the coal be pulverized and mixed with water near the mine site to produce the slurry. Once the slurry mixture reaches Mohave, the water is extracted and the coal is dried. The water source for the slurry process and for all other water requirements of the mine is the N-Aquifer. The aquifer and a well serving it are also on the land of the Hopi Tribe and Navajo Nation.

Approximately 4,400 acre-feet per year is extracted from the N-Aquifer to slurry the coal. The Hopi Tribe opposes the further pumping of the N-Aquifer after 2005. Beginning in 2001, SCE and the other Mohave co-owners restarted past efforts to develop an alternative water source to the N-Aquifer for the slurry line. During the pendency of SCE's application, the parties determined that the only potentially viable alternative is the C-Aquifer. In addition to the uncertain water supply, coal supply has also come into question.

In D.04-12-016, the Commission, among other actions, authorized SCE to continue working on resolution of the essential water and coal issues, including the funding of the C-Aquifer hydro-geological and environmental studies. Once the questions of available water and coal are assessed, the Commission will review those costs and determine if it can make a final decision on the future of Mohave as a coal-fired plant.

Numerous parties participated in this proceeding, including: The Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, the Center for Energy and Economic Development, The Utility Reform Network (TURN), Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), Natural Resources Defense Council, and WEC.

Nine parties filed protests to SCE's application. On October 11, 2002, a combined Prehearing Conference (PHC) and Public Participation Hearing was held at the Navajo Chapter House in Tuba City, Arizona. On January 7, 2003, the assigned Commissioner issued a Scoping Memo; a second PHC was held May 23, 2003, and evidentiary hearings were held June 14 through July 9, 2004. Concurrent opening and reply briefs were filed August 9 and August 24, 2004, respectively; the proposed decision (PD) was mailed on October 20, 2004; final oral argument was heard on November 30, 2004; comments and reply comments to the PD were received, and on December 2, 2004, the Commission issued its decision in the proceeding. No applications for rehearing or petitions for modification were filed. The proceeding is closed.

WEC actively participated in all phases of the proceeding focusing on water issues and the solar alternative. WEC submitted testimony eight times, filed opening and reply briefs and comments on the PD, and participated in PHCs, hearings, and oral argument.

WEC provided a unique perspective in this proceeding. WEC represented the indigenous people living on Black Mesa—the people who will be significantly affected by the Commission's decision on whether to continue the operation of Mohave as a coal-burning plant, or to close it. As such, WEC represented members of both the Navajo Nation and the Hopi Tribe. While the Hopi Tribe and the Navajo Nation each had its own representative in the

proceeding, WEC expressed the voice from Black Mesa—the area where the coal is mined. The Black Mesa area is a vast empty area in which most of the inhabitants do not have access to telephone, e-mail or computer service.

WEC also provided the Commission with information on the spiritual significance of Black Mesa groundwater to both the Hopi and Navajo cultures and why the N-Aquifer may no longer be used as a source of water after 2005 to slurry the coal from the Black Mesa mine area to the Mohave plant in Laughlin, Nevada. WEC provided information on the significance of water issues, in general, to residents of the Four Corners area of Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado.

Requirements for Awards of Compensation

The intervenor compensation program, enacted in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812, requires California jurisdictional utilities to pay the reasonable costs of an intervenor's participation if the intervenor makes a substantial contribution to the Commission's proceeding. The statute provides that the utility may adjust its rates to collect the amount awarded from its ratepayers.

All of the following procedures and criteria must be satisfied for an intervenor to obtain a compensation award:

1. The intervenor must satisfy certain procedural requirements including the filing of a sufficient notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation within 30 days of the PHC (or in special circumstances, at other appropriate times that we specify). (Section 1804(a).)
2. The intervenor must be a customer or a participant representing consumers, customers, or subscribers of a utility subject to our jurisdiction. (Section 1802(b).)

3. The intervenor should file and serve a request for a compensation award within 60 days of our final order or decision in a hearing or proceeding. (Section 1804(c).)
4. The intervenor must demonstrate “significant financial hardship.” (Sections 1802(g), 1804(b)(1).)
5. The intervenor’s presentation must have made a “substantial contribution” to the proceeding, through the adoption, in whole or in part, of the intervenor’s contention or recommendations by a Commission order or decision. (Sections 1802 (h), 1803(a).)
6. The claimed fees and costs are comparable to the market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services. (Section 1806.)

For discussion here, the procedural issues in Items 1-4 above are combined, followed by separate discussions on Items 5 and 6.

Procedural Requirements

The initial PHC in this matter was held on October 11, 2002. WEC timely filed its NOI on November 7, 2002. In its NOI, WEC addressed its anticipated scope of participation, estimated cost of participation, customer status and significant financial hardship. WEC timely filed its request for compensation on January 28, 2005, within 60 days of D.04-12-016. WEC’s request for compensation includes a description of its substantial contribution to the decision, as well as a detailed description of services and expenditures.

Pursuant to an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling dated May 14, 2003, WEC was found to be a customer pursuant to Section 1802(b), has met the requirement for financial hardship pursuant to Section 1804(a)(2)(B), and was found to be eligible for intervenor compensation in this proceeding.

Substantial Contribution

In evaluating whether a customer made a substantial contribution to a proceeding we look at several things. First, did the ALJ or Commissioner adopt one or more of the factual or legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations put forward by the intervenor? (*See* Section 1802(h).) Second, if the customer's contentions or recommendations paralleled those of another party, did the customer's participation materially supplement, complement, or contribute to the presentation of the other party or to the development of a fuller record that assisted the Commission in making its decision? (*See* Sections 1802(h), 1802.5.) As described in Section 1802(h), the assessment of whether the customer made a substantial contribution requires the exercise of judgment.

In assessing whether the customer meets this standard, the Commission typically reviews the record, composed in part of pleadings of the customer and, in litigated matters, the hearing transcripts, and compares it to the findings, conclusions, and orders in the decision to which the customer asserts it contributed. It is then a matter of judgment as to whether the customer's presentation substantially assisted the Commission.²

Should the Commission not adopt any of the customer's recommendations, compensation may be awarded, if, in the judgment of the Commission, the customer's participation substantially contributed to the

² D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC 2d, 628 at 653.

decision or order.³ With this guidance in mind, we turn to the claimed contributions WEC made to the proceeding.

Solar Alternative

WEC first identified solar as one of the few generation resources available on Black Mesa and continued to provide the Commission with information concerning solar generation alternatives throughout the proceeding.⁴ The Commission adopted WEC's recommendation for an evaluation of the solar alternative to Mohave. In D.04-12-016, Finding of Fact (FOF) 19, the Commission stated "Edison should investigate alternative resources to first allow for a meaningful comparison of Mohave's costs with other alternatives including the WEC solar ..." Again in Conclusion of Law 5 and Ordering Paragraph 3, the decision references studying proposals for alternatives to Mohave that were advanced by WEC.

Water Issues

WEC provided the Commission with information on the cultural significance of the N-Aquifer to both the Hopi Tribe and Navajo Nation, and worked within the Hopi and Navajo Tribal Councils to unify opposition to the continued use of the N-Aquifer for coal slurring purposes after 2005. The unified opposition helped the Commission to focus on exploration into alternative water sources. In FOF 7, the Commission found that "The Hopi and

³ See D. 03-12-019, discussion D. 89-03-063 (31 CPUC 2d 402) (awarding San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace and Rochelle Becker compensation in the Diablo Canyon Rate Case because their arguments, although ultimately unsuccessful, forced the utility to thoroughly document the safety issues involved).

⁴ WEC Testimony, March 26, 2003.

Navajos oppose further pumping of the N-Aquifer for coal slurry purposes post 2005.”

WEC also influenced the Commission to ask the parties to brief the water supply issue. From this briefing, the Commission learned that the Mohave plant itself would experience water supply problems post 2026. FOF 12 says: “The Mohave plant itself needs additional water for cooling purposes over and above the water extracted from the slurry mixture and Mohave’s contract for this cooling water expires in 2006: there is no assurance that water will be available after the contract terminates.”

WEC also provided the Commission with extensive information on the C-Aquifer, which is currently the subject of a feasibility study the Commission authorized SCE to fund in D.04-12-016.

Authorization for Environmental Upgrades

WEC argued throughout the proceeding that the Commission did not have sufficient information to proceed with the refurbishment of Mohave until the water and coal issues were resolved. Other parties, particularly the Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation and Peabody, urged the Commission to issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity (CPCN) for the required upgrades. However, the Commission adopted WEC's recommendation. D.04-12-016, FOF 16 states: "Until there is a resolution of the water and coal supply issues, this Commission does not have enough data to determine if the future functioning of Mohave as a coal-burning facility is in the public interest and that the necessary \$1.2 billion investment will inure to the benefit of Edison ratepayers."

Overall, WEC achieved a significant level of success on the issues it raised, and WEC made a substantial contribution to this proceeding. We now determine whether WEC's compensation request is reasonable.

Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

WEC requested \$314,247.09⁵ for its participation in this proceeding, itemized as follows:

⁵ An increase of \$374.38 from the amount claimed to adjust for a computation error.

Advocate/Expert	Type	Hour/Rate⁶	Total⁷
James Weil	Policy	19.6/\$250	\$5,954.63
Lon House	Primary witness/Advocate	658.1/\$260	\$188,582.10
Vernon Masayesva	Black Mesa Trust/Policy	75/\$175	\$15,524.40
Jerry Honawa	Hopi-Native Expert	6/\$50	\$300.00
Leonard Selestewa	Hopi-Native/Local	43.75/\$50	\$2,187.50
Tanya Lee	Black Mesa Trust/Admin.	77.1/\$150	\$11,565.00
Andrea Hartley	Black Mesa Trust/Admin.	48.5/\$75	\$3,637.50
Nicole Horseherder	Navajo/To Nizhoni Ani-Policy	364/\$150	\$70,821.83
Marshall Johnson	Navajo/To Nizhoni Ani-Native/Local	283/\$50	<u>\$15,674.13</u>
		Total	\$314,247.09

The components of this request must constitute reasonable fees and costs of the customer's preparation for and participation in a proceeding that resulted in a substantial contribution. Thus, only those fees and costs associated with the customer's work that the Commission concludes made a substantial contribution are reasonable and eligible for compensation.

On February 28, 2005, SCE filed a response to WEC's claim for compensation pointing out certain components of the claim that might not be allowable under the intervenor statutes and precedent. In particular, SCE took

⁶ Includes professional time only at full hourly rate.

⁷ In addition to professional time, claim includes claim preparation and travel at 50% hourly rate plus expenses.

issue with two categories of WEC's request: (1) compensation for preparing press releases and lobbying Navajo Nation governmental bodies that was not in preparation for Commission hearings (Pub. Util. Code § 1803), and (2) compensation for administrative overhead (Pub. Util. Code § 1803).

While SCE is correct that Pub. Util. Code § 1803, and Commission decisions on intervenor compensation, do not allow recovery for such activities, we are persuaded by WEC's reply comments⁸ that some limited exceptions to the normal prohibition are warranted here because of the unique nature of situation of the inhabitants of the Black Mesa.

To begin, WEC conceded that some of its requested claim for compensation was not supported by the statutes and voluntarily reduced its request accordingly. Specifically, WEC reduced expert Masayesva's request by \$5,818.75, the amount to which SCE objected. In addition, WEC withdrew its request for \$3,637.50 for Hartley's time, based on SCE's objection.

However, WEC presents arguments in support of the remainder of its compensation claim. As explained by WEC, representing the Navajo and Hopi who inhabit the vast area of the Black Mesa, where the mining activity takes place, presented unique communications issues. The Navajo Nation and the Hopi Tribe each had its own advocate participating in all phases of this proceeding. WEC was also representing members of both tribes who live on the Black Mesa and who will most be affected by the Commission's decision on Mohave. As WEC argued in support of its claim for "lobbying" time, "the two tribes don't get along in the best of times, and our work was doubly difficult

⁸ WEC filed Reply To Edison's Response on March 8, 2005.

because most of the Navajos we spoke for live on the Hopi Partition Land on Black Mesa . . .”⁹ Much of WEC’s time was spent meeting and consulting with the inhabitants of Black Mesa in an attempt to reach consensus on their position regarding the continued operation of Mohave. When the cultural differences are compounded with the communication impediments of no telephone, e-mail or computer access in many parts of the Black Mesa area, WEC’s argument in support of compensation for “consensus building” has some justification.

While the facts are sympathetic and WEC presented a cogent argument in support of the time spent lobbying/consensus building, we are constrained by the statute and these activities do not fit into the “preparing for litigation” category. Therefore, we are unable to grant WEC’s claims for \$29,742.31 for Horseherder and \$5,540.53 for Johnson.

SCE also objected to WEC’s request for \$11,565.00 for Tanya Lee and \$2,187.50 for Leonard Selestewa as being “administrative costs” that are not recoverable. WEC responded that Lee’s activities were comparable to that of a paralegal in that she was responsible for receiving all the documents in the proceeding, summarizing them for the Black Mesa Board, then conveying testimony and policy directives back from the Board to WEC. Part of the critical importance of Lee’s function was that she was stationed in Flagstaff, Arizona, where she had computer and other office equipment access, and could insure timely receipt and delivery of documents for the proceeding. WEC states that Lee spent almost 40% of her time reading and summarizing the documents. Considering this, we will allow 40% of Lee’s requested compensation, and

⁹ WEC Reply, p. 2.

reduce the amount requested for her by 60%, awarding a total of \$4,635.00 for her work.

WEC argues that Selestewa's fees should be allowed since, as President of the Black Mesa Trust, he was responsible for policy directives for the Commission proceeding, and as such the fees are not "administrative" work. We are convinced these fees were properly incurred as preparation for Black Mesa's participation in the proceeding and will allow them.

WEC documented its claimed hours by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours of its advocates, policy analysts and experts, along with a brief description of each activity. Given the scope of WEC's participation and the work products prepared, the number of claimed hours is reasonable. Since we find that WEC's efforts made a substantial contribution to the decision, we need not exclude from WEC's award any compensation for hours on specific issues. We only reduce WEC's hours as discussed above.

Productivity

D.98-04-059 directed intervenors to demonstrate productivity by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to ratepayers. The costs of an intervenor's participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized their participation. This showing assists us in determining the overall reasonableness of the request.

Although we adopted many of WEC's recommendations, it is difficult to attribute specific quantifiable benefits to its participation. Over the life of Mohave, or alternatives, however, net financial savings deriving from recommendations by WEC will likely exceed the intervenor compensation claim. For example, urging the Commission to explore alternatives that could either replace Mohave if it is closed permanently, or work simultaneously with Mohave

if it is kept open, may prove to be a prudent course of action. In addition, WEC's contributions on water issues was valuable to the Commission's understanding of why the N-Aquifer would no longer be used to slurry the coal and why an alternative water source should be found before determining the fate of Mohave. WEC was instrumental in advancing our understanding of the C-Aquifer, and we were persuaded that it was in the best interest of SCE ratepayers to authorize the funding of the C-Aquifer feasibility and environmental studies. Thus, we find WEC's participation productive.

Finally, in determining compensation, we take into consideration the market rates for similar services from comparably qualified persons. In this proceeding, WEC used two advocates and policy experts on energy matters, five policy experts on native matters and one "paralegal."¹⁰

Requested Rates

James Weil

WEC is requesting \$250/hour for policy expert Weil's services in 2004 and half that amount for his assistance in preparing WEC's compensation claim in 2005.¹¹ This same rate was previously approved by the Commission in D.05-03-016, and we find it reasonable here.

Lon House

¹⁰ WEC characterized Lee as an Executive Assistant, but the Commission is allowing fees for her work summarizing testimony and pleadings, work that is comparable to that of a paralegal.

¹¹ The reduced rate for travel and preparation of the compensation claim is consistent with Commission practice, D.89-09-046.

WEC is seeking \$260/hour for the services House performed as an advocate and expert. WEC did not utilize an attorney in this proceeding. House has a B.A., two M.A.s and a Ph.D. His background and qualifications match those of Weil. As detailed with specificity in the claim, House seeks \$260, as he has three graduate degrees and a varied energy regulatory experience, worked at the California Energy Commission and this Commission, and testified before other Commissions and Boards. WEC also claims this proceeding required his particular expertise in many areas. Based on House's experience and expertise, we approve a rate of \$260/hour.

Tanya Lee

WEC requests \$150/hour for Tanya Lee, who performed work in 2004 equivalent to that of a paralegal. In comparison, a rate of \$145/hour was approved for paralegal Barbara Nelson for work performed in 2003, in D.04-08-025. Considering a normal escalation of Nelson's rate, and based on Lee's qualifications and job function in this proceeding we approve the \$150/hour rate.

Vernon Masayesva

WEC requests \$175/hour for the services of Masayesva as a policy and native expert in this proceeding. Masayesva has a B.A. and a M.A., is past Chairman of the Hopi Tribe and is currently President of the Black Mesa Trust. While Masayesva's education is similar to others who were awarded \$150/hour by the Commission for work performed in 2003,¹² WEC argues for \$175/hour based on his unique experience and accomplishments. We agree and will grant

¹² California Hydropower Reform Coalition's witness David Sutton (B.A., M.B.A.) and Steve Rothrert (B.A., M.S.), D.04-08-025.

Masayesva \$175/hour, as we find that rate reasonable and justified by his experience and education.

Nichole Horseherder

WEC seeks \$150/hour for the services of Horseherder as an expert in Navajo matters. Horseherder is multilingual, and she procured and translated the Dine' Elders' testimonies in this proceeding and provided policy guidance to WEC. Horseherder's education and experience is similar to others to whom the Commission awarded \$150/hour for 2003 work. We approve a rate of \$150/hour for Horseherder for 2004.

Jerry Honawa, Leonard Selestewa, Marshall Johnson

WEC is seeking \$50/hour for the testimony and/or guidance from each of these individuals. While they do not have college degrees, each has unique knowledge of the people, culture and environs of Black Mesa and contributed to the Commission's understanding of the geography and culture of the area. While WEC could not present any comparable rates, these individuals did contribute to the proceeding and we approve that rate.

The incidental costs for WEC's participation in this proceeding, including copying, postage, telephone, facsimile, research and travel to San Francisco were reasonable and necessary for WEC to participate in the proceeding, and should be compensated in full.

Award

We award WEC \$262,578.00, as set forth below:

Advocate/Expert	Capacity	Hour/Rate¹³	Total¹⁴
James Weil	Policy	19.6/\$250	\$5,954.63
Lon House	Primary witness/Advocate	658.1/\$260	\$188,582.10
Vernon Masayesva	Black Mesa Trust	\$175	\$9,705.65
Jerry Honawa	Hopi	6/\$50	\$300.00
Leonard Selestewa	Hopi	43.75/\$50	\$2,187.50
Tanya Lee	Black Mesa Trust	30.9/\$150	\$4,635.00
Nicole Horseherder	Navajo/To Nizhoni Ani	364/\$150	\$41,079.52
Marshall Johnson	Navajo/To Nizhoni Ani	283/\$50	<u>\$10,133.60</u>
		Total	\$262,578.00

Consistent with previous Commission decisions, we will order that interest be paid on the award amount¹⁵commencing the 75th day after WEC filed its compensation request and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to this award, and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. WEC's records should identify specific issues for which it requested compensation, the actual time spent by each employee, the applicable

¹³ Professional time only at full hourly rate.

¹⁴ In addition to professional time, claim includes claim preparation and travel at 50% hourly rate plus expenses.

¹⁵ At the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper, as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15.

hourly rate, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation was claimed.

Waiver of Comment Period

Pursuant to Rule 77(f)(6) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the otherwise applicable 30-day period for public review and comment is waived.

Assignment of Proceeding

Michael R. Peevey is the Assigned Commissioner and Carol A. Brown is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. WEC represents consumers, customers, or subscribers of SCE, a utility regulated by the Commission.
2. WEC timely filed an NOI on November 7, 2002, following a PHC on October 11, 2002.
3. On May 14, 2003, pursuant to an ALJ ruling on WEC's NOI, WEC was found to be eligible for an award of intervenor compensation.
4. WEC timely filed its request for intervenor compensation on January 28, 2005, within 60 days of issuance of D.04-12-016.
5. SCE filed an objection to specific items of WEC's claim for compensation.
6. WEC made a substantial contribution to D.04-12-016.
7. WEC's requested hourly rates for attorneys and experts are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.
8. The total of these reasonable fees and costs is \$262,578.00. The Appendix to the opinion summarizes today's award.

Conclusions of Law

1. WEC has fulfilled the requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation, and is entitled, to the extent set forth in the foregoing opinion, to intervenor compensation for its claimed fees and expenses incurred in making substantial contributions to D.04-12-016.

2. The comment period should be waived, and today's order should be made effective immediately.

O R D E R**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Water and Energy Consulting (WEC) is awarded \$262,578.00 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision 04-12-016.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) shall pay this award to WEC.

3. SCE shall also pay interest on the award beginning April 13, 2005, at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, and continuing until full payment is made.

4. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision(s):	
Contribution Decision(s):	D0412016
Proceeding(s):	A0205046
Author:	ALJ Brown
Payer(s):	Southern California Edison Company

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Reason Change/Disallowance
Water and Energy Consulting	1/28/2005	\$314,247.09	\$262,578.00	Admin. Hours Reduced. Lobbying Activity Disallowed.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
James	Weil	Expert	Water and Energy Consulting	\$250	2004	\$250
Lon	House	Expert	Water and Energy Consulting	\$260	2004	\$260
Tanya	Lee	Admin.	Water and Energy Consulting	\$150	2004	\$150
Vernon	Masayeva	Expert	Water and Energy Consulting	\$175	2004	\$175
Nicole	Horseherder	Expert	Water and Energy Consulting	\$150	2004	\$150
Jerry	Honawa	Expert	Water and Energy Consulting	\$50	2004	\$50
Leonard	Selestewa	Expert	Water and Energy Consulting	\$50	2004	\$50
Marshall	Johnson	Expert	Water and Energy Consulting	\$50	2004	\$50